

**HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Attorney Docket No.: 200314021-1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

<b>Inventor(s):</b>	Bill Serra et al.	<b>Confirmation No.:</b>	7889
<b>Serial No.:</b>	10/809,958	<b>Examiner:</b>	William Wong
<b>Filed:</b>	March 25, 2004	<b>Group Art Unit:</b>	2178
<b>Title:</b>	MONITORING SYSTEM AND METHOD		

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief in connection with the decisions of the Examiner in a Final Office Action dated June 29, 2007. It is respectfully submitted that the present application has been twice rejected. Each of the topics required in an Appeal Brief and a Table of Contents are presented herewith and labeled appropriately.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

(1)	Real Party In Interest .....	4
(2)	Related Appeals And Interferences.....	4
(3)	Status Of Claims.....	4
(4)	Status of Amendments.....	4
(5)	Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter.....	4
(6)	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal.....	6
(7)	Arguments.....	6
	Rejection of claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.....	6
	Rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473 in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322.....	7
	Rejection of claims 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473 in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322 and further in view of Jacoby U.S. Patent No. 5,768552,.....	13
(8)	Conclusion.....	19
(9)	Claim Appendix .....	20

<b>(10) Evidence Appendix .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>(11) Related Proceedings Appendix .....</b>	<b>24</b>

**(1) Real Party In Interest**

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P.

**(2) Related Appeals And Interferences**

There are no other appeals or interferences related to this case.

**(3) Status Of Claims**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected.

The rejection of claims 1-2 is appealed.

**(4) Status of Amendments**

No amendment has been filed subsequent to the Final Office Action dated June 29, 2007.

**(5) Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter**

Claim 1 provides for a monitoring system comprising:

a plurality of sensor elements for distribution at a location (page 1, lines 21-22; page 4, lines 14-18; figure 1),

a plurality of cameras for capturing video data of the location (page 1, line 23; page 4, lines 19-21; figure 1),

a display unit for displaying a graphical representation of a network of the sensor elements throughout the location and a video stream from any one of the cameras (page 1, lines 24-26; page 2, lines 16-19; figures 1, 2),

a navigation unit for navigating through the network of sensor elements displayed by the display unit (page 1, lines 27-28; page 2, lines 19-22; page 5, lines 15-17; figures 1, 2), and

a processing unit for selecting one of the cameras as the source of the video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements (pages 1 line 29 – page 2, line 2; page 2, lines 25-29; figure 1).

Claim 5 provides a method of monitoring a location comprising the steps of:

obtaining monitoring data from a plurality of sensor elements distributed at the location (page 1, lines 13-15; page 5, lines 28-29; figures 1, 3),

capturing video data of the location utilizing a plurality of cameras (page 5, lines 29-31, figures, 1, 3),

navigating through a network of the sensor elements (page 5, lines 32-33, figures 2, 3),

displaying a graphical representation of a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements (page 5, line 33- page 6, line 6, figure 2), and

simultaneously displaying a video stream from one of the cameras selected based on the current navigation position (page 6, lines 4-6, figures 2, 3).

Claim 9 provides a computer readable medium for storing a computer program comprising program code instructing a computer to perform a method of monitoring a location, the method comprising the steps of (page 6, lines 10-31; figure 1):

obtaining monitoring data from a plurality of sensor elements distributed at the location (page 1, lines 13-15; page 5, lines 28-29; figures 1, 3),

capturing video data of the location utilizing a plurality of cameras (page 5, lines 29-31, figures, 1, 3),

navigating through a network of the sensor elements (page 5, lines 32-33, figures 2, 3),

displaying a graphical representation of a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements (page 5, line 33- page 6, line 6, figure 2), and

simultaneously displaying a video stream from one of the cameras selected based on the current navigation position (page 6, lines 4-6, figures 2, 3).

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

I Whether claims 9-12 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

II Whether claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473 in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322.

III Whether claims 3, 7, and 11 are unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473 in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322 and further in view of Jacoby U.S. Patent No. 5,768,552.

**(7) Arguments**

**I Rejection of claims 9-12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter**

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, Examiner has states that page 6 of the specification states that computer readable media includes “transmission media such as digital, analog, and wireless communication links” and that such media would include electromagnetic waves or signals (i.e. energy) and therefore constitutes non-statutory matter. Appellant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9-12 as being unpatentable as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

**The Applicable Law**

“Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim.” *E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3ComCorp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003). MPEP, Section 2111.01 II states that it is improper to

import claim limitations from the specification. MPEP Section 2111.01 II further elaborates:

“Though understanding the claim language may be aided by explanations contained in the written description, it is important not to import into a claim limitations that are not part of the claim. For example, a particular embodiment appearing in the written description may not be read into a claim when the claim language is broader than the embodiment.” *Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.*, 358F3d.870, 875, 69 USPQ2d 1865, 1868 (Fed. Cir. 2004)

*The rejection of claims 9-12 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter should be withdrawn*

Claims 9-12 recite a computer readable medium for storing a computer program comprising program code instructing a computer to perform a method of monitoring a location. Claims 9-12 do not recite the limitation that the computer readable medium includes “transmission media such as digital, analog, and wireless communication links.” Examiner has inappropriately imported an alleged limitation of an embodiment of the invention described in the specification into an interpretation of the claims at issue. Since the rejection of claims 9-12 are founded on an impermissible importation of an alleged limitation appearing in the specification but not recited by the claims at issue, Appellant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9-12 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter be withdrawn.

**II     Rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473 in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322.**

The Examiner has rejected claims claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473

(hereinafter referred to as "Crain") in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322 (hereinafter referred to as "Monroe et al."). Appellant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10 and 12 as being unpatentable.

*The Applicable Law*

The Examiner has the burden under 35 U.S.C. §103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, \_\_\_, 550 U.S., 1396, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007); *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

The Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. §103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* (hereinafter referred to as "The Guidelines") defines the following rationale for rejecting a claim as obvious based on a combination of prior art references:

*Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results*

The Guidelines state that Examiner must articulate the findings detailed below to support a conclusion that a claim is rendered obvious based on the above-referenced rationale. The Guidelines further state that if any of the findings detailed below cannot be made, then this rationale cannot be used to support a conclusion that that the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

*(1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of the actual combination of elements in a single prior art reference;*



*(2) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods, and that in combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately;*

*(3) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable; and*

*(4) whatever the additional findings based on the Graham factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.*

#### The Crain Reference

Crain generally discloses an emergency action system that includes a subsystem for monitoring and controlling security at a facility (col. 4, lines 59-61). A plurality of video cameras, sensors, and actuators are distributed throughout the facility. The emergency action system includes a number of user consoles, where each user console includes a left monitor for presenting imagery from selected surveillance video cameras and a right monitor for presenting an alarm map showing the particular types and locations of the different alarms distributed throughout the facility (FIG. 5b). Camera view selection switches and camera controls are mounted beneath the left monitor. (col. 12, lines 21-30). Each user console further includes a third display for displaying a graphical user interface to the emergency action system. Controls, such as for example, a mouse or window control pad, enable a user to interact with the graphical user interface. (col. 12, lines 50-64). The graphical user interface displayed on the third console enables a user to control the operation of the sensors and actuators and the alarm map displayed on the right display monitor provides insight into the specific locations of particular sensors and actuators in the facility (col. 17, lines 15-36).

*The Monroe et al. Reference*

Monroe et al. generally discloses a system for selectively displaying a video stream generated by one of a plurality of cameras distributed throughout a facility. A primary screen window includes a map window and a video window. The map window contains a map of the facility including a plurality of camera icons and a plurality of sensor icons where each icon represents the location of the associated camera or sensor within the facility (paragraph 19). When a user positions a mouse pointer over a camera icon or a sensor icon in the map of the facility displayed in the map window for a brief period of time, a bubble appears containing the associated camera or sensor name (paragraph 21, 22). To display the video stream associated with a specific camera, the user selects the camera by double clicking on the camera icon associated with that camera from the map of the facility displayed in the map window and the video stream generated by the selected camera is displayed in the video window (paragraph 21).

*The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10 and 12 as being unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) over Crain in view of Monroe et al. should be withdrawn because the cited prior art references, either in combination or alone, fail to disclose each and every element recited by the claims at issue*

Independent claim 1 recites a monitoring system including inter alia a plurality of sensor elements, a plurality of cameras, a display unit, a navigation unit and a processing unit. The plurality of sensor elements are for distribution at a location and the plurality of cameras are for capturing video data of the location. The display unit is for displaying a graphical representation of a network of the sensor elements throughout the location and a video stream from any one of the cameras. The navigation unit is for navigating through the network of sensor elements displayed by the display unit. The processing unit is for selecting one of the cameras as the source of the video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements.

Independent claim 5 recites a method of monitoring a location. The method includes obtaining monitoring data from a plurality of sensor elements distributed at the location, capturing video data of the location utilizing a plurality of cameras, navigating through a network of the sensor elements, displaying a graphical representation of a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and simultaneously displaying a video stream from one of the cameras selected based on the current navigation position.

Independent claim 9 recites a computer readable medium for storing a computer program. The computer program includes program code for instructing a computer to perform a method of monitoring a location where the method includes obtaining monitoring data from a plurality of sensor elements distributed at the location, capturing video data of the location utilizing a plurality of cameras, navigating through a network of the sensor elements, displaying a graphical representation of a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and simultaneously displaying a video stream from one of the cameras selected based on the current navigation position.

Crain does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and displaying the video stream from the selected camera as recited by the claims at issue. In fact, in Crain, the disclosed graphical representation of the alarm map is not even an interactive display and cannot be used to select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream for display. Crain teaches the use of camera view selection switches to select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream for display.

Appellant respectfully submits that the above-stated deficiencies of the disclosure of Crain with respect to claims 1, 5 and 9 are not cured by the disclosure of Monroe et al.

Monroe et al. does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and displaying the video stream from the selected camera as recited by the claims at issue. In contrast, Monroe et al. displays a bubble with the name of the camera or sensor associated with a camera icon or sensor icon based on a current navigation position in the map of the facility. When a user wishes to view an area of the facility in Monroe et al., the user identifies a camera that the user believes provides a view of that area of the facility, and selects the identified camera by double clicking on the associated camera icon in the map of the facility. Merely positioning a cursor over a camera icon does not automatically result in the display of the video stream generated by the camera in the video window as recited by the claims at issue. In Monroe et al, the user may go through a trial and error process to identify which specific camera to select to view the desired area of the monitored area. The claimed invention allows a user to navigate through a network of sensor elements and to automatically view the area of the monitored area under the surveillance of the specific sensors associated with the current navigation position within the network of sensors. In other words, unlike the teachings of Monroe et al., the claimed invention automatically selects the camera that provides the best view of the monitored area under the surveillance of the sensors associated with the current navigation position without any additional input from the user.

The Guidelines specify that a rationale to support a conclusion that a claim would have been obvious is that all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and that one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and in combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Since Crain and Monroe et al. either alone or in combination fail to disclose or even suggest that it would be desirable or even possible to navigate through a

displayed network of sensor elements, select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream using a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and display the video stream from the selected camera as recited by claims 1, 5, and 9, it is therefore evident that the claims are not obvious thereover.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 5, and 9 as being unpatentable over Crain and in view of Monroe et al. be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2 and 4 which further define patentably distinct independent claim 1, dependent claims 6 and 8, which further define patentably distinct independent claim 5, and dependent claims 10 and 12, which further define patentably distinct independent claim 9, include all of the elements recited by each of the respective independent claims and therefore are allowable over Crain in view of Monroe et al. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**III Rejection of claims 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473 in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322 and further in view of Jacoby U.S. Patent No. 5,768,552.**

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable over Crain, U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473 (hereinafter referred to as "Crain") in view of Monroe et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097322 (hereinafter referred to as "Monroe et al.") and further in view of Jacoby, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,552 (hereinafter referred to as "Jacoby"). Appellant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable.

*The Applicable Law*

The Examiner has the burden under 35 U.S.C. §103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, \_\_\_, 550 U.S., 1396, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007); *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

The Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. §103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* (hereinafter referred to as "The Guidelines") defines the following rationale for rejecting a claim as obvious:

*Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results*

The Guidelines state that Examiner must articulate the findings detailed below to support a conclusion that a claim is rendered obvious based on the above-referenced rationale. The Guidelines further state that if any of the findings detailed below cannot be made, then this rationale cannot be used to support a conclusion that that the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

*(1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of the actual combination of elements in a single prior art reference;*

*(2) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods, and that in combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately;*

*(3) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable; and*

*(4) whatever the additional findings based on the Graham factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.*

#### The Crain Reference

Crain generally discloses an emergency action system that includes a subsystem for monitoring and controlling security at a facility (col. 4, lines 59-61). A plurality of video cameras, sensors, and actuators are distributed throughout the facility. The emergency action system includes a number of user consoles, where each user console includes a left monitor for presenting imagery from selected surveillance video cameras and a right monitor for presenting an alarm map showing the particular types and locations of the different alarms distributed throughout the facility (FIG. 5b). Camera view selection switches and camera controls are mounted beneath the left monitor. (col. 12, lines 21-30). Each user console further includes a third display for displaying a graphical user interface to the emergency action system. Controls, such as for example, a mouse or window control pad, enable a user to interact with the graphical user interface. (col. 12, lines 50-64). The graphical user interface displayed on the third console enables a user to control the operation of the sensors and actuators and the alarm map displayed on the right display monitor provides insight into the specific locations of particular sensors and actuators in the facility (col. 17, lines 15-36).

#### The Monroe et al. Reference

Monroe et al. generally discloses a system for selectively displaying a video stream generated by one of a plurality of cameras distributed throughout a facility. A primary screen window includes a map window and a video window. The map window

contains a map of the facility including a plurality of camera icons and a plurality of sensor icons where each icon represents the location of the associated camera or sensor within the facility (paragraph 19). When a user positions a mouse pointer over a camera icon or a sensor icon in the map of the facility displayed in the map window for a brief period of time, a bubble appears containing the associated camera or sensor name (paragraph 21, 22). To display the video stream associated with a specific camera, the user selects the camera by double clicking on the camera icon associated with that camera from the map of the facility displayed in the map window and the video stream generated by the selected camera is displayed in the video window (paragraph 21).

*The Jacoby Reference*

Jacoby generally discloses generating a graphical representation of network topology and traffic activity within the network using a network map window and a viewing window (col. 6, lines 48-50). The network map window is used to display a reduced scale version of the entire network topology. A user manipulates a yellow window within the network map window and the area of the network map enclosed with the area of the yellow window is displayed in the viewing window. A control device, such as for example a cursor control device, can be used to manipulate the position of the yellow window in the network map window (col. 8 line 38 – col. 9 line 8).

*The rejection of claims 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) over Crain in view of Monroe et al. and further in view of Jacoby should be withdrawn because the cited prior art references, either in combination or alone, fail to disclose each and every element recited by the claims at issue*

Claims 3, 7, and 11 depend from independent claims 1, 5 and 9, respectively, and therefore include each of the elements of independent claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively.



Crain does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and displaying the video stream from the selected camera as recited by the claims at issue. In fact, in Crain, the disclosed graphical representation of the alarm map is not even an interactive display and cannot be used to select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream for display. Crain teaches the use of camera view selection switches to select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream for display.

Appellant respectfully submits that the above-stated deficiencies of the disclosure of Crain with respect to claims 3, 7, and 11 are not cured by the disclosure of Monroe et al.

Monroe et al. does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and displaying the video stream from the selected camera as recited by the claims at issue. In contrast, Monroe et al. displays a bubble with the name of the camera or sensor associated with a camera icon or sensor icon based on a current navigation position in the map of the facility. When a user wishes to view an area of the facility in Monroe et al., the user identifies a camera that the user believes provides a view of that area of the facility, and selects the identified camera by double clicking on the associated camera icon in the map of the facility. Merely positioning a cursor over a camera icon does not automatically result in the display of the video stream generated by the camera in the video window as recited by the claims at issue. In Monroe et al, the user may go through a trial and error process to identify which specific camera to select to view the desired area of the monitored area. The claimed invention allows a user to navigate through a network of sensor elements and to automatically view the area of the monitored area under the surveillance of the specific sensors associated

with the current navigation position within the network of sensors. In other words, the claimed invention automatically selects the camera that provides the best view of the monitored area under the surveillance of the sensors associated with the current navigation position without any further input from the user.

Appellant respectfully submits that the above-stated deficiencies of the combination of the disclosures of Crain and Monroe et al. with respect to claims 3, 7, and 11 are not cured by the disclosure of Jacoby.

Jacoby does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, and selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and displaying the video stream from the selected camera as recited by the claims at issue. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable over Crain in view of Monroe et al. and further in view of Jacoby be withdrawn.

The Guidelines specify that a rationale to support a conclusion that a claim would have been obvious is that all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and that one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and in combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Since Crain, Monroe et al., and Jacoby either alone or in combination fail to disclose or even suggest that it would be desirable or even possible to navigate through a displayed network of sensor elements, select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream using a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and display the video stream from the selected camera as recited by claims 1, 5, and 9, it is therefore evident that the claims are not obvious thereover. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 5, and 9 as being unpatentable over Crain in view of Monroe et al. and further in view of Jacoby be withdrawn.

PATENT

Atty Docket No. 200314021-1  
App. Ser. No.: 10/809,958

**(8) Conclusion**

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claims 1-12 as being unpatentable is improper. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that such rejections by the Examiner be reversed and these claims be allowed. Attached below for the Board's convenience is an Appendix of claims 1-12, as currently pending.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 3, 2007

By Manisha Chakrabarti  
Manisha Chakrabarti  
Registration No.: 41,665

MANISHA CHAKRABARTI, ESQ.  
3108 South Route 59  
Suite 124-282  
Naperville, Illinois 60564  
(630) 355-3376

**(9) Claim Appendix**

1. A monitoring system comprising:
  - a plurality of sensor elements for distribution at a location,
  - a plurality of cameras for capturing video data of the location,
  - a display unit for displaying a graphical representation of a network of the sensor elements throughout the location and a video stream from any one of the cameras,
  - a navigation unit for navigating through the network of sensor elements displayed by the display unit, and
  - a processing unit for selecting one of the cameras as the source of the video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements.
2. A system as claimed in claim 1, comprising:
  - a plurality of actuator elements for distribution at the location,
  - the display unit displaying a graphical representation of a network of the sensor and actuator elements,
  - the navigation unit enabling navigation through the network of sensor and actuator elements, and
  - a control unit for controlling the actuator elements through user input in response to information obtained from the graphical representation and the video stream.
3. A system as claimed in claim 1, the processing unit overlaying a frame boundary element over the video stream corresponding to a displayed frame of the graphical representation.
4. A system as claimed in claim 1, the control unit updating configuration data associated with the network of sensors and actuators in response to the user input.

5. A method of monitoring a location comprising the steps of:  
obtaining monitoring data from a plurality of sensor elements distributed at the location,  
capturing video data of the location utilizing a plurality of cameras,  
navigating through a network of the sensor elements,  
displaying a graphical representation of a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and  
simultaneously displaying a video stream from one of the cameras selected based on the current navigation position.
6. A method as claimed in claim 5, comprising the steps of:  
providing a plurality of actuator elements at the location,  
displaying a graphical representation of a network of the sensor and the actuator elements,  
navigating through the network of sensor and actuator elements, and  
controlling the actuator elements in response to information obtained from the graphical representation and the video stream.
7. A method as claimed in claim 5, comprising overlaying a frame boundary element corresponding to a current displayed frame of the graphical representation on the video stream.
8. A method as claimed in claim 5, comprising updating configuration data associated with the network of sensors and actuators in response to the user input.

9. A computer readable medium for storing a computer program comprising program code instructing a computer to perform a method of monitoring a location, the method comprising the steps of:

obtaining monitoring data from a plurality of sensor elements distributed at the location,

capturing video data of the location utilizing a plurality of cameras,

navigating through a network of the sensor elements,

displaying a graphical representation of a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and

simultaneously displaying a video stream from one of the cameras selected based on the current navigation position.

10. The computer readable medium as claimed in claim 9, wherein the method comprises the steps of:

displaying a graphical representation of a network of the sensor elements and a network of actuator elements at the location,

navigating through the network of sensor and actuator elements, and

controlling the actuator elements in response to information obtained from the graphical representation and the video stream.

11. The computer readable medium as claimed in claim 9, wherein the method comprises overlaying a frame boundary element corresponding to a current displayed frame of the graphical representation on the video stream.

12. The computer readable medium as claimed in claim 9, wherein the method comprises updating configuration data associated with the network of sensors and actuators in response to the user input.

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No. 200314021-1  
App. Ser. No.: 10/809,958

**(10) Evidence Appendix**

None.

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No. 200314021-1  
App. Ser. No.: 10/809,958

**(11) Related Proceedings Appendix**

None.